

CREATION AS EXPLAINED
IN THE
TANTRA.



CREATION AS EXPLAINED IN THE TANTRA.(1)

A psychological analysis of our worldly experience ordinarily gives us both the feeling of persistence and change. This personal experience expresses a cosmic truth. An examination of any doctrine of creation similarly reveals two fundamental concepts, those of Being and Becoming, Changelessness and Change, the One and the Many. In Sanskrit they are called the Kûzastha and Bhava or Bhavana. The first is the Spirit or Purusha or Brahman who is true Being (Sat) pure consciousness (Chit) and pure transcendental feeling or Bliss (Ânanda). According to Indian notions the Spirit as such *is* and never becomes. It is Nature which is the subject of change. We may understand Nature in a twofold sense : first as the root principle or noumenal cause of the phenomenal world that is as Principle of Becoming and secondly as such world. Nature in the former sense is Mûlaprakrîti which means that which exists as the root (Mûla) substance of things before (Pra) creation (Krîti) and which in association with Spirit (Chit) either truly or apparently creates, maintains and destroys the Universe. This Mûlaprakrîti the Shâradâ Tilaka calls Mûlabhûta Avyakta and the Vedânta (of Shangkara to which I alone refer) Mâyâ.

Nature in the Second sense that is the phenomenal world which is a product of Mûlaprakrîti is the compound of the evolutes from this root substance which are called Vikrîtis in the Sângkhya and Tantra and name and form (Nâmarûpa) by the Vedântins who attribute them to ignorance (Avidyâ). Mûlaprakrîti as the material and instrumental cause of things is that potentiality of natural power (natura naturans) which manifests as the Universe (natura naturata).

Touching these two Principles there are certain fundamental points of agreement in the three systems which I am examining Sângkhya, Vedânta and the Advaitavâda of the Tantra. They are as follows. Spirit or Brahman or Purusha as Sat, Chit,

(1) A paper read by Mr. Justice J. G. Woodroffe at the Silver Jubilee of the Chaitanya Library Calcutta held on the 18th January 1915 under the Presidency of H. E. The Governor of Bengal,

Ânanda is Eternal Conscious Being. It is changeless and has no activity (Karttrittva). It is not therefore in itself a cause whether instrumental or material; though in so far as Its simple presence gives the appearance of consciousness to the activities of Prakṛiti It may in such sense be designated an efficient cause. So according to Sāṅkhya Prakṛiti reflects Puruṣa and in Vedānta Avidyā of the three Guṇas takes the reflection of Chidānanda. On the other hand the substance or factors of Mūlaprakṛiti or Māyā are the three Guṇas or the three characteristics of the principle of Nature according to which it reveals (Sattva) or veils (Tamas) Spirit (Chit) and the activity or energy (Rajas) which urges Sattva and Tamas to operation.

It also is Eternal but is unconscious (Ahit) Becoming. Though it is without consciousness (Chaitanya) it is essentially activity (Karttrittva) motion and change. It is a true cause instrumental and material of the World. But notwithstanding all the things to which Mūlaprakṛiti gives birth, its substance according to Sāṅkhya and Tantra is in no wise diminished by the production of the Vikṛitis or Tattvas; the Guṇas which constitute it ever remaining the same. The source of all becoming is never exhausted though the things which are therefrom produced appear and disappear.

Passing from the general points of agreement to those of difference we note firstly those between the Sāṅkhya and Vedānta. The Sāṅkhya is commonly regarded as a dualistic system which affirms that both Puruṣa and Prakṛiti are real, separate and, except for the purpose of creation, independent Principles. The Vedānta however says that there cannot be two Principles which are both absolutely real. It does not however altogether discard the dual principles of the Sāṅkhya but says that Mūlaprakṛiti which it calls Māyā while real from one point of view, that is empirically, is not truly real from another and transcendental standpoint. It affirms therefore that the only real (Sad-vastu) is the attributeless (Nirguṇa) Brahman. All else is Māyā and its products. Whilst then the Sāṅkhyan Mūlaprakṛiti is an Eternal Reality, it is according to the transcendental method of Shankara an eternal unreality (Mithyā-bhūtā Sanātani). The empirical reality which is really false is due to the Avidyā which is inherent in the nature of the embodied spirit (Jīva). Māyā is Avastu or no real thing. It is Nistattva. As Avidyā is unreal so is its cause or Māyā. The world is then untranscendentally unreal. The kernel of the Vedāntik

argument on this point is to be found in its interpretations of the Vaidik Mahāvākya "That Thou art" (Tat tvam asi). Tat here is Īshvara that is Brahman with Mâyā as His body or Upādhi. Tvam is the Jīva with Avidyā as its body. It is then shown that Jīva is only Īshvara when Mâyā is eliminated from the latter and Avidyā from Jīva. Therefore only as Brahman is the Tvam the Tat; therefore neither Mâyā nor Avidyā really exist (they are Avastu) for otherwise the equality of Jīva and Īshvara could not be affirmed. This conclusion that Mâyā is Avastu has far reaching consequences both religious and philosophical and so has the denial of it. It is on this question that there is a fundamental difference between Shankara's Advaita-vāda and that of the Tantra which I am about to discuss.

Before however doing so I will first contrast the notions of creation in Sāṅkhya and Vedānta. It is common ground in all three systems that creation is the appearance produced by the action of Mūlaprakṛiti or principle of Nature (Achi) existing in association with the Spirit or Chi. According to both Sāṅkhya and Tantra, in Mūlaprakṛiti or the potential condition of the Natural Principle the Guṇas are in a state of equality (Sāmyāvasthā) that is they are not affecting one another. But as Mūlaprakṛiti is essentially movement it is said that even when in this state of equality the Guṇas are yet continually changing into themselves (Sarūpaparināma). This inherent subtle movement is the nature of the Guṇa itself and exists without effecting any objective result. Owing to the ripening of Adṛishta or Karma creation takes place by the disturbance of this equality of the Guṇas (Guṇakṣobha) which then commence to oscillate and act upon one another. It is this initial creative motion which is known in the Tantra as Cosmic Sound (Parashabda). It is through the association of Puruṣha with Mūlaprakṛiti in cosmic vibration (Spandana) that creation takes place. The whole universe arises from varied forms of this grand initial motion. So scientific "matter" is now currently held to be the varied appearance produced in our minds by vibration of and in the single substance called ether. This new western scientific doctrine of vibration is in India an ancient inheritance. "Hṛīṅ the Supreme Hangsa dwells in the brilliant heaven." The word "Hangsa" comes, it is said, from the word Hanti which means Gati or Motion. Sāyana says that It is called Āditya because It is in perpetual motion. But Indian teaching carries the application of this doctrine beyond the scientific ether which is a physical substance (Mahābhūta). There is vibration in the

causal body that is of the *Gunas* of *Mûlaprakṛiti* as the result of *Sadṛishaparizāma* of *Parāshabdasṛishṭi*; in the subtle body of mind (*Antaḥkarana*); and in the gross body compounded of the *Bhûtas* which derive from the *Tanmâtras* their immediate subtle source of origin. The *Hiranyagarbha* and *Virât* Sound is called *Madhyamâ* and *Vaikharî*. If this striking similarity between ancient Eastern wisdom and modern scientific research has not been recognised it is due to the fact that the ordinary Western Orientalist and those who take their cue from him in this country are prone to the somewhat contemptuous belief that Indian notions are of "historical" interest only and as such a welcome addition possibly for some intellectual museum but are otherwise without value or actuality. The vibrating *Mûlaprakṛiti* and its *Gunas* ever remain the same though the predominance of now one and now another of them produces the various evolutes called *Vikṛitis* or *Tattvas* which constitute the world of mind and matter. These *Tattvas* constitute the elements of the created world. They are the well known *Buddhi*, *Ahangkâra*, *Manas* (constituting the *Antaḥkarana*) the ten *Indriyas*, five *Tanmâtras* and five *Mahâbhûtas* of "ether" "air" "fire" "water" and "earth" which of course must not be identified with the notions which the English terms connote. These *Tattvas* are names for the elements which we discover as a result of a psychological analysis of our worldly experience. That experience ordinarily gives us both the feeling of persistence and change. The former is due to the presence of the *Âtmâ* or *Chit-shakti* which exists in us in association with *Mûlaprakṛiti*. This is the *Chaitanya* in all bodies. Change is caused by *Mûlaprakṛiti* or *Mâyâshakti* and its elements may be divided into the subjective and objective *Tattvas* or what we call mind and matter. Analysing again the former we discover an individuality (*Ahangkâra*) sensing through the *Indriyas* a world which forms the material of its percepts and concepts (*Manas* and *Buddhi*). The object of thought or "matter" are the varied compounds of the *Vaikṛita* creation which are made up of combinations of the gross elements (*Mahâbhûta*) which themselves derive from the subtle elements or *Tanmâtra*. Now according to *Sâṅkhya* all this is real, for all are *Tattvas*. *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛiti* are *Tattvas* and so are the *Vikṛitis* of the latter.

According to the *Vedânta* also creation takes place through the association of the Brahman then known as the Lord or *Īshvara* (*Mâyopâdhika-Chaitanyam Īshvaraḥ*) with *Mâyâ*.

That is Chit is associated with, though unaffected by, Mâyâ which operates by reason of such association to produce the universe. But really only the unchanging Sad-vastu or Brahman exists. The ever changing world is, when viewed by the spiritually wise (Jnânî), nothing but an unreal phantasm imposed by the World-dreamer on the Changeless Sat. It is true that it has the quality of being in accordance with the greatest principle of order namely that of causality. It is the Sat however which gives to the World-dream the character of orderliness because it is on and in association with that pure Chit, or Sat that the World-dream plays. It is true that behind all this unreal appearance there is the Real, the Brâhman. But the phenomenal world has no real substratum existing as its instrumental and material cause. The Brahman is no true cause and Mâyâ is unreal (Avastu). The world has only the appearance of reality from the reflection which is cast by the real upon the unreal. Nor is Îshvara, the creative and ruling Lord, in a transcendental sense real. For as it is the Brahman in association with the World-dream which Shankara calls Îshvara, the latter, is nothing but the Brahman viewed through the World-dream. It follows that the universe is the illusory product of the association of the real and the unreal and when this dream ends in liberation (Mukti) the notion of Îshvara as its creator no longer exists. For His body is Mâyâ and this is Avastu. So long however as there is a world, that is so long as one is subject, however slightly, to the World-dream or to any extent or in any degree embodied, so long do we recognise the existence of Îshvara. The Lord truly exists for every Jîva so long as he is such. But on attainment of bodiless liberation (Videha Mukti) the Jîva becomes himself Sachchidânanda and as such Îshvara does not exist for him; for Îshvara is but the Sat viewed through the World-dream of which the Sat is free. "The Brahman is true, the world is false. The Jîva is Brahman (Paramâtmâ) and nothing else."

The opponents of this system or Mâyâvâda have charged it with being a covert form of Buddhistic nihilism (Mâyâvâdam asachchhâstrang prachchhanang bauddham). It has however perhaps been more correctly said that Shrî Shankara adjusted his philosophy to meet the Mâyâvâda of the Buddhists and so promulgated a new theory of Mâyâ without abandoning the faith or practice of his Shaiva dharma.

All systems obviously concede at least the empirical reality

of the world. The question is whether it has a greater reality than that and if so in what way? Sāṅkhya affirms its reality. Shankara denies it in order to secure the complete unity of the Brahman. Each system has merits of its own. Sāṅkhya by its dualism is able to preserve in all its integrity the specific character of Chit as Niranjana. This result on the other hand is effected at the cost of that unity for which our mind has a kind of metaphysical hunger. Shankara by his Mâyāvāda secures this unity, but this achievement is at the cost of a denial of the reality of the world whether considered as the product (*vikṛiti*) of Mûlaprakṛiti or as Mûlaprakṛiti itself.

There is however another alternative and that is the great Tāntrik doctrine of Duality in Unity. There is, this Shâstra says, a middle course in which the reality of the world is in one sense affirmed without compromising the truth of the unity of the Brahman for which Shankara by such lofty speculation contends. I here shortly state what is developed more fully later. The Tāntrik Advaitavāda in distinction from that of Shankara recognises the reality of Mûlaprakṛiti though it holds that Vikṛiti is, in a sense I state later, unreal. Here in a qualified way it follows the Sāṅkhya. On the other hand it differs from the Sāṅkhya in holding that Mûlaprakṛiti or Mâyâshakti is not a principle separate from the Brahman but exists in and as a principle of the one Brahman substance. The world therefore as mere appearance is not real in the Indian sense of that term but the ground principle of such appearance or Mâyâshakti is real. There is thus a reality behind all appearances a real natural substance behind the apparent transformations. And as Mâyâ which is the body of Īshvara is both eternal and real so is Īshvara. I pass now to the Advaitavāda of the Tantra:

The Indian Tantra is not a formal system of philosophy (Darshana). It is in the broadest sense a generic term for the writings and various traditions which express the whole culture of a certain epoch in Indian History. The contents are therefore of an encyclopædic character, religion, ritual, domestic rites, law, medicine, magic, and so forth. It has thus great historical value which appears to be the most fashionable form of recommendation for the Indian Scriptures now-a-days. The mere historian, I believe, derives encouragement from the fact that out of bad material may yet be made good history. I am not here concerned with this aspect of the matter. For my present

purpose the Tantra is part of the Upâsanâ kânda of the three departments of Shruti and is a system of physical, psychical and moral training (Sâdhana) worship, and Yoga. It is thus essentially practical. This is what it claims to be. To its critics it has appeared to be a system of immoral indiscipline. I am not here concerned with the charge but with the doctrine of creation to be found in this Shâstra. Underlying however all this practice, whatsoever be the worth or otherwise which is attributed to it, there is a philosophy which must be abstracted as I have here done for the first time with some difficulty, from the disquisitions on religion and the ritual and Yoga directions to be found in the various Tantras. The fundamental principles are as follows.

The equality (Sâmya) of the Gunas is Mûlaprakṛiti which has activity (Kartṛitva) but no consciousness (Chaitanya). Brahman is Sachchidânanda who has Chaitanya and no Kartṛitva. It is true therefore that considered in themselves and without reference to the other they are separate distinguishable and differently characterised Principles. But this is so only if we endeavour so to think of them. As a matter of fact however the two admittedly ever and everywhere co-exist and cannot except for the purpose of formal demonstration be thought of without the other. The connection between the two is one of unseparateness (Avinâbhâva Sambandha). Brahman does not exist without Prakṛiti or Prakṛiti without the Brahman. Some call the Supreme Chaitanya with Prakṛiti, others Prakṛiti with Chaitanya. Some worship It as Shiva ; others as Shakti. Both are one and the same. Shiva is the one viewed from Its Chit aspect. Shakti is the one viewed from Its Mâyâ aspect. They are the " male " and " female " aspects of the same Unity which is neither male nor female. Akula is Shiva. Kula is Shakti. The same Supreme is worshipped by Sâdhana of Brahman as by Sâdhana of Âdyâshakti. The two cannot be separated, for Brahman without Prakṛiti is actionless and Prakṛiti without Brahman is unconscious. According to Sâṅkhya Prakṛiti is eternal and so is the Mâyâ of Shankara. There is Nishkala Shiva or the transcendent attributeless (Nirguna) Brahman ; and Sakala Shiva or the embodied immanent Brahman with attributes (Saguna).

Kalâ corresponds with the Sâṅkhyan Mûlaprakṛiti or Sâmyâvasthâ of the three Gunas and the Vedântic Mâyâ. But Kalâ which is Mûlaprakṛiti and Mâyâ eternally exists

and therefore when we speak of Niskala Shiva it is not meant that there is then or at any time no Kalâ for Kalâ ever exists but that Brahman is meant which is thought of as being without the working Prakṛiti (Prakṛiter-anyaḥ). Mâyâ Shakti is then latent in it. As the Devî in the Kulachûḍâmani says "Ahang Prakṛitirûpâ chet Chidânanda-parâyanâ." Sakala Shiva is on the other hand Shiva considered as associated with Prakṛiti in operation and manifesting the world. In one case Kalâ is working or manifest, in the other it is not, but exists in a potential state. In the same way the two Shivas are one and the same. There is one Shiva who is Nirguṇa and Saguṇa. The Tântrik Yoga treatise *Shatchakranirûpana* describes the Jîvâtmâ as the Paryyâya of, that is another name for, the Paramâtmâ; adding that the root of wisdom (Mûlavidyâ) is a knowledge of their identity. When the Brahman manifests It is called Shakti which is the magnificent concept round which Tantra is built. The term comes from the root "Shak" which means "to be able." It is the power whereby the Brahman manifests Itself and the Brahman Itself; for Shakti and possessor of Shakti (Shaktimân) are one and the same. As Shakti is Brahman it is also Nirguṇâ and Saguṇâ. The former is Chit Shakti, that is Chit in association with the operating Prakṛiti as the efficient cause of the creation; and Mâyâ Shakti which means Mâyâ as a Shakti that is in creative operation as the instrumental (Nimitta) and material (Upâdâna) cause of the universe. This is the Shakti which produces Avidyâ just as Mahâmâyâ or Îshvara is the Great Liberatrix. These twin aspects of Shakti appear throughout creation. Thus in the body, the Chit or Brahman aspect is conscious Âtmâ or Spirit and the Mâyâ aspect is the Antaḥkarana and its derivatives or the unconscious (Jada) mind and body. When however we speak here of Shakti without any qualifications what is meant is Chit Shakti in association with Mâyâ Shakti that is Îshvara or Devî or Mahâmâyâ the Mother of all worlds. If we keep this in view we shall not fall into the error of supposing that the Shâktas (whose religion is one of the oldest in the world; how old indeed is as yet little known) worship material force or gross matter. Îshvara or Îshvarî is not Achit which as pure Sattvaguna is only His or Her body. Mâyâ Shakti in the sense of Mûlaprakṛiti is Achit.

In a certain class of Indian images you will see the Lord with a diminutive female figure on His lap. The makers and worshippers of those images thought of Shakti as being in the

subordinate position which some persons consider a Hindu wife should occupy. This is however not the conception of Tantra according to which She is not a handmaid of the Lord but the Lord Himself being but the name for that aspect of His in which He is the Mother and Nourisher of the worlds. As Shiva is the transcendent, Shakti is the immanent aspect of the one Brahman who is Shiva-Shakti. Being Its aspect, It is not different from, but one with It. In the *Kulachûdamazî Nigama* the Bhairavî addressing Bhairava says "Thou art the Guru of all, I entered into Thy body (as Shakti) and thereby Thou didst become the Lord (Prabhu). There is none but Myself Who is the Mother to create (*Kâryyavibhâvinî*). Therefore it is that when creation takes place Sonship is in Thee. Thou alone art the Father Who wills what I do (*Kâryyavibhâvaka*; that is She is the vessel which receives the nectar which flows from Nityânanda). By the union of Shiva and Shakti creation comes (*Shiva-Shakti-samâyogât jâyate srishṭīkalpanâ*). As all in the universe is both Shiva and Shakti (*Shivashaktimaya*) therefore Oh Maheshvara Thou art in every place and I am in every place. Thou art in all and I am in all." The creative Word thus sows Its seed in Its own womb.

Such being the nature of Shakti the next question is whether Mâyâ as Shangkara affirms is Avastu. It is to be remembered that according to his empirical method it is taken as real but transcendently it is alleged to be an eternal unreality because the object of the latter method is to explain away the world altogether so as to secure the pure unity of the Brahman. The Tantra is however not concerned with any such purpose. It is an Upâsanâ Shâstra in which the world substance and its Lord have reality. There cannot be Sâdhana in an unreal world by an unreal Sâdhaka of an unreal Lord. The Tantra replies to Mâyâvâda:—if it be said that Mâyâ is in some unexplained way Avastu yet it is admitted that there is something, however unreal it may be alleged to be, which is yet admittedly eternal and in association, whether manifest or unmanifest, with the Brahman. According to Shangkara Mâyâ exists as the mere potentiality of some future World-dream which shall arise on the ripening of *Adṛishṭa* which Mâyâ is. But in the *Mahânirvâna Tantra*, Shiva says to Devî "Thou art Thyself the Parâ Prakṛiti of the Param-âtmâ," (Ch. IV v. 10). That is Mâyâ in the sense of *Mûla-prakṛiti* which is admittedly eternal is not Avastu but exists in the Brahman as one of two principles, the other of which is

Chit. In Niszkala Shiva, Shakti lies inactive. It manifests in and as creation though Chit thus appearing with the three Gunas is neither exhausted nor affected thereby. We thus find Īshvarī addressed in the Tantra both as Sachchidānandarūpīnī and Trigunātmikā referring to the two real principles which form part of the one Brahman substance. The philosophical difference between the two expositions appears to lie in this. Shankara says that there are no distinctions in Brahman of either of the three kinds; svagata-bheda that is distinction of parts within one unit, svajātiya-bheda or distinction between units of one class; or vijātiya-bheda or distinction between units of different classes. Bhāratī however the Commentator on the Mahānirvāṇa (Ch. II v. 34) says that Advaita there mentioned means devoid of the last two classes of distinction. There is therefore for the purposes of Tantra a svagata bheda in the Brahman Itself namely the two aspects according to which the Brahman is on the one hand, Being, Spirit, Chit and on the other the principle of becoming (Achit) which manifests as Nature. In however a mysterious way there is an union of these two principles (Bhāvayoga) which thus exist without derogation from the partless unity of the Brahman which they are. In short the Brahman may be conceived as having twin aspects in one of which It is the cause of the world and appears to change and in the other of which It is the unchanging Soul of the World. Whilst the Brahman Svarūpa or Chit is Itself immutable the Brahman is yet through its associated Māyik principle the cause of change for Prakṛiti creates the world.

But what then is "real"; a term not always correctly understood. According to Indian notions the "real" is that which ever was, is and will be (Kālatraya-sattvān); in the words of the Christian liturgy "as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be world without end"; therefore that which changes, which was not, but is, and then ceases to be is according to this definition "unreal" however much from a practical point of view it may appear real to us. Now Māyāvāda calls Mūlaprakṛiti the material cause of the world unreal (Avastu). The Tantra says that the Principle, whence all becoming comes, exists as a real substratum so to speak below the world of names and forms. This Māyā is an eternal reality. What is unreal are these names and forms (Avidyā) that is the changing worlds (asat-trilokī-sād-bhānang svarūpang Brahmanasā smṛitam Ch. III v. 7 Mahānirvāṇa Tantra). These are unreal

for they are not permanent but come and go. The body is called *Sharira* which comes from the root *Shrri*—"to decay" for it is dissolving and being renewed at every moment until death. Again however real it may seem to us the world is unreal in the sense that it is something other than what it seems to be. This thing which I now hold in my hands seems to me to be paper, which is white, smooth and so forth yet we are told that it really is something different namely a number of extraordinarily rapid vibrations of etheric substance producing the false appearance of scientific "matter". In the same way (as those who worship Yantras know) all nature is the appearance produced by various forms of motion in *Prākṛitic* substance. The real is the Brahman which all things are (*sarvvaṃ khalvidam Brahma*) that is Spirit and that associated primordial substance which in a way unknown to us exists in It but without derogation from Its partless spiritual unity. That this is not perceived is due to *Avidyā* or those limitations which are inherent in our nature as created beings (*Jīva*). The Brahman whether in Its *Chit* or *Mâyā* aspect eternally and changelessly endures but *Avidyā* appears to break up its undivided unity into the unreal that is changing manifold world of names and forms which are imputed to it.

It follows from the above that as *Mâyā* is the body of *Īshvara*, the *Īshvara* body is in *Tantra* eternal though in dissolution (*Pralaya*) it exists in a latent potential state. Whilst the phenomenal world is unreal the World-principle or body of the Lord is an eternal reality. *Īshvarī* is not therefore in the terms of the *Paravidyā* of *Shankara* a transitory appearance of the Brahman viewed through the veil. As the reality of *Mūlaprakṛiti* is affirmed the theory is in this sense dualistic (*Dvaitavāda*) but again it is monistic (*Advaitavāda*) for as *Shankara* points out (*Comm. Shvetāshvātara Up 1. 2*) *Devātma-shakti*, the cause of the world, is not separate from the *Paramātmā* as *Sāṅkhya* alleges its *Pradhāna* to be. And thus it is that *Shiva* in the *Kulārṇava Tantra* (I. 110) says "some desire dualism (*Dvaitavāda*) others monism (*Advaitavāda*). Such however know not My truth which is beyond both monism and dualism (*dvaitādvaitavivarjita*)". This saying may doubtless mean that to "the knower (*Jñānī*) the arguments of philosophical systems are of no account as is indeed the case. It has also a more literal meaning as above explained. The *Shāstra* in fact makes high claims for itself. The *Tantra*, it has been said, takes into its arms as if they were its two children

both dualism and monism affording by its practical method (Sâdhana) and the spiritual knowledge generated thereby the means by which their antimonies are resolved and harmonized. Its purpose is to give liberation to the Jîva by a method according to which monistic truth is reached through the dualistic world; immersing its Sâdhakas in the current of Divine Bliss by changing duality into unity and then evolving from the latter a dualistic play thus proclaiming the wonderful glory of the Spouse of Paramashiva in the love embrace of matter (Jada) and Spirit (Chaitanya). It therefore says that those who have realised this move and yet remain unsoiled in the mud of worldly actions which lead others upon the downward path. It claims therefore that its practical method (Sâdhana) is more speedily fruitful than any other. Its practical method is an application of the general principles above described. In fact one of its Âchâras which has led to abuse is an attempt to put into full practice the theory of Advaitavâda. Shangkara has in his transcendental method dealt with the subject as part of the Jnâna Kânda. Though the exponent of the Mâyâvâda is esteemed to be a Mahâpurusha this method is not in favour with the Tântrik Sâdhaka who attributes much of the practical atheism which is to be found in this country as elsewhere to the transcendental doctrines of Mâyâvâda. There is some truth in this charge for as has been well said the vulgarization of Shangkara's "Higher Science" which is by its nature an esoteric doctrine destined for a small minority must be reckoned a misfortune in so far as it has in the language of the Gîtâ induced many people to take to another's Dharma instead of to their own which is the "Lower Science" of the great Vedântin followed in all Shâstras of worship. Such a Shâstra must necessarily affirm God as a real object of worship. Dionysius the Areopagite the chief of the line of all Christian mystics said that we could only speak "apophatically" of the Supreme as It existed in Itself that is other than as It displays Itself to us. Of It nothing can be affirmed but that It is not this and not that. Here he followed the "neti neti" of the Vedânta. Îshvarî is not less real than the things with which we are concerned every day. She is for the Indian Sâdhaka the highest reality and what may or may not be the state of Videha Mukti has for him, no practical concern. Those only who have attained it will know whether Shangkara is right or not, not that they will think about this or any other subject; but in the sense that when the Brahman is known all is known. A friend from whom I quote, writes that he

had once occasion to learn to what ridiculous haughtiness some of the modern "adepts" of Shri Shangkara's school are apt to let themselves be carried away when one of them spoke to him of the personal Ishvara as being a "pitiable creature". The truth is that such so called "adepts" are no adepts at all being without the attainment and far from the spirit of Shangkara—whose devotion and powers made him seem to be to his followers an incarnation of Shiva Himself. Such a remark betrays a radical misunderstanding of the Vedānta. How many of those, who to-day discuss his Vedānta from a merely literary standpoint, have his or indeed any faith? What some would do is to dismiss the faith and practice of Shangkara as idle superstition and to adopt his philosophy. But what is the intrinsic value of a philosophy which emanates from a mind which is so ignorant as to be superstitious? Shangkara however has said that faith and Sādhana are the preliminaries for competency (Adhikāra) for the Jñānakāṇḍa. He alone is competent (Adhikārī) who possesses all good moral and intellectual qualities, faith (Shraddhā) capacity for the highest contemplation (Samādhi) the Sāṅkhyan discrimination (Viveka), absence of all desire for anything in this world or the next, and an ardent longing for liberation. There are few indeed who can claim even imperfectly all such qualifications. But what of the rest? There is no Vaidik Karmakāṇḍa in operation in the present age but there are other Shāstras of worship which is either Vaidik, Tāntrik or Paurāṇik. These provide for those who are still, as are most, on the path of desire. The Tantra affirms that nothing of worth can be achieved without Sādhana. Mere speculation is without result. This principle is entirely sound whatever may be thought of the mode in which it is sought to be applied. Those to whom the questions here discussed are not mere matters for intellectual business or recreation will recall that Shangkara has said that liberation is attained not merely by the discussion of and pondering upon revealed truth (Vichāra) for which few only are competent but by the grace of God (Ishvara Anugraha) through the worship of the Mother and Father from whom all creation springs. Such worship produces knowledge. In the Kulachûḍāmāni the Devī says:—"Oh all-knowing One if Thou knowest Me then of what use are the Āmnāyas (revealed teachings) and Yājanam (ritual)? If Thou knowest Me not then again of what use are they?" But neither are in another sense without their uses for thereby the Sādhaka becomes qualified for some form of Ūrdhvhāmnāya in which there are no rites (Karma).

With this short exposition of the nature of Shaktitattva according to Tantra I pass to an equally brief account of its manifestation in the Universe. There are some apparent varieties of details in the various Tantras. Our present knowledge of this little known Shâstra is so small that it would be hazardous (even were it possible which is by no means certain) to construct a scheme with claims to represent their combined teachings. Nor is it necessary for the present purpose to do so. It is sufficient to deal with the main lines of the doctrine without going into their very great accompanying detail. I here follow on the main theme the account given in the celebrated Shâradâ Tilaka a work written by Lakshmanâchâryya the Guru of Abhinava Gupta the great Kashmirian Tântrik about the commencement of the eleventh century and its Commentary by the learned Tântrik Pandit Râghava Bhatta which is dated 1454 A.D.

Why creation takes place cannot in an ultimate sense be explained. It is the play (Lîlâ) of the Mother. Could this be done the Brahman would be subject to the law of causality which governs the Universe but which its Cause necessarily transcends.

The Tantra however in common with other Indian Shâstras recognises *Adrishta Srishti* or the doctrine that the impulse to creation is proximately caused by the *Adrishta* or Karma of Jîvas. But Karma is eternal and itself requires explanation. Karma comes from Sangskâra and Sangskâra from Karma. The process of creation, maintenance and dissolution, according to this view, unceasingly recurs as an eternal rhythm of cosmic life and death which is the Mother's play (Lîlâ). And so it is beautifully said of Her in the Lalitâ Sahasranâma that "the series of universes appear and disappear with the opening and shutting of Her Eyes." The existence of Karma implies the will to cosmic life. We produce it as the result of such will. And when produced it becomes itself the cause of it.

In the aggregate of Karma which will at one period or another ripen there is at any particular time some which are ripe and others which are not so. For the fruition of the former only creation takes place. When this seed ripens and the time therefore approaches for the creation of another universe the Brahman manifests in Its Vishvarûpa aspect so that the Jîva may enjoy or suffer therein the fruits of his Karma and (unless liberation be attained) accumulate fresh Karma which will involve

the creation of future worlds. When the unripened actions which are absorbed in Mâyâ become in course of time ripe the *Vṛtti* of Mâyâ or Shakti in the form of desire for creation arises in Paramashiva for the bestowal of the fruit of this Karma. This state of Mâyâ is variously called by Shruti, *Īkshana*, *Kāma*, *Vichikîrṣā*.

It is when the Brahman "saw" "desired" or "thought" "May I be many" that there takes place what is known in Tantra as *Sadṛishaparizāma* in which the Supreme Vindu appears. This in its triple aspect is known as *Kāmakalā* a manifestation of Shakti whence in the manner hereafter described the Universe emanates. This *Kāmakalā* is the *Mûla* or root of all Mantra. Though creation takes place in order that Karma may be suffered and enjoyed, yet in the aggregate of Karma which will at one time or another ripen there is at any particular period some which are ripe and others which are not so. For the fruition of the former only creation takes place. As creation will serve no purpose in the case of Karma which is not ripe there is after the exhaustion by fruition of the ripe Karma a dissolution (*Pralaya*). Then the Universe is again merged in Mâyâ which thus abides until the ripening of the remaining actions. Karma like everything else re-enters the Brahman and remains there in a hidden potential state as it were a seed. When the seed ripens creation again takes place.

With *Īkshana* or the manifestation of creative will creation is really instantaneous. When the "Word" went forth "Let there be light" there *was* light for the ideation of *Īshvara* is creative. Our mind by its constitution is however led to think of creation as a gradual process. The *Sāṅkhya* starts with the oscillation of the *Gunas* (*Gunakṣobha*) upon which the *Vikṛtis* immediately appear. But just as it explains its real *Parizāma* in terms of successive emanations so the Tantra describes a *Sadṛishaparizāma* in the body of *Īshvara* their cause. This development is not a real *Parizāma* but a resolution of like to like, that is there is no actual change in the nature of the entity dealt with, the various stages of such *Parizāma* being but names for the multiple aspects to us of the same unchanging Unity,

For the sake of *Upāsana* a development only is described in *Īshvara* but as it is apparent it is really a species of *Vivartta*. What is called an evolution is but another name or aspect of

that which is the immutable subject of such ideal process. Shakti is one. It appears as various by its manifestation in various functions. There can of necessity be no real *Parinâma* for in the first place *Sachchidânanda* or pure Spirit is as such immutable. Before and after creation in every state It remains what It was. There is therefore no real *Parinâma* in or of the *Aksharabrahman* as such. Nor again though *Prakṛiti* is the source of change is it changing here. For *Mâyâ* considered as the body of *Īshvara* is undifferentiated that is as such it is assumed not to change. And this must be so for directly there is a real development (*parinâma*) the *Jîva* body of *Avidyâ* appears. Even the three *gunas* do not change each remaining what it is. They are the same in all forms but appear to the *Jîva* to exist in different combinations. The appearance of the *gunas* in different proportions is due to *Avidyâ* or *Karma* which is this apparent *Gunakshobha*. The three worlds are *Asat*. It is *Sangskâra* which gives to the *Sâmya Prakṛiti* the appearance of an existence as *Vaishkâmya*. *Īshvara* is free of all *Avidyâ*. What the Tantra describes as *Sadrishaparinâma* is but an analysis of the different aspects of what is shortly called in other *Shâstras* *Īkshana*. This *Sadrishaparinâma* is concerned with the evolution of what is named *Parâ Sound* (*Parashabdasrishti*). This is Cosmic Sound; the causal vibration in the substance of *Mûlaprakṛiti* which gives birth to the *Tattvas* which are its *Vikṛitis*: such Cosmic Sound being that which is distinguished in thought from the *Tattvas* so produced.

The *Sharadâ* says that from the *Sakala Parameshvara* who is *Sachchidânanda* issued *Shakti*. This *Shakti* is not in a sense co-extensive with the *Parameshvara* but is only that power of Him which is necessary for creation. God and His power are more than the creation which He manifests. *Shakti* is said to issue from that which is already *Sakala* or associated with *Shakti* because as *Râghava Bhatta* says She who is eternal (*Anâdirûpa*) existed in a subtle state as it were *Chaitanya* during the great dissolution (*pralaya*). *Yâ Anâdirûpâ Chaitanyâdhyâsena Mahâ-pralaye Sûksmâ Sthitâ*. This important passage contains the whole teaching on this particular point. *Adhyâsa* is the attribution of the nature of one thing to another according to which something is considered to be what it is not. In other words during *Pralaya* there is some principle in the *Brahman* which is not *Chit* but which owing to the absence of operation is identified with it. *Chit* and *Mâyâ* appear as the former the latter being suppressed.

With however the disturbance of the *Gunās Prakṛiti* became inclined (*Uchchhîṇā*) to creation and in this sense is imagined to issue. Shakti in other words passes from a potential state to one of actuality. The Parameshvara is, he adds, described as *Sachchidānanda* in order to affirm that even when the Brahman is associated with *Avidyā* its own true nature (*Svarūpa*) is not affected. According to the *Shāradā*, from this Shakti issues *Nāda* and from the latter *Vindu* (known as the *Paravindu*). The *Shāradā* thus enumerates seven aspects of Shakti. This it does according to *Rāghava Bhaṭṭa* so as to make up the seven component parts of the *Oṅkāra*. In some *Shākta Tantras* this first *Nāda* is omitted and there are thus only six aspects. The *Shaiva Tantras* mention five. Those which recognise *Kalā* as a *Tattva* identify *Nāda* with it. In some *Tantras* *Kalā* is associated with *Tamogunā* and is the *Mahākālā* who is both the child and spouse of *Ādyāshakti*; for creation comes from the *Tāmasic* aspect of Shakti. In the *Shāradātilaka* *Nāda* and *Vindu* are the same as Shakti being the names of two of Her states which are considered to represent Her as being more prone to creation (*Uchchhîṇāvasthā*). There are two states of *Shaktivindu* which It creates (*upayogyāvasthā*). As there is no mass or *ghana* in *Nisṭhā* *Shiva* that Brahman represents the *aghanāvasthā*. The *Prapanchasāra Tantra* says that She who is in the first place *Tattva* (mere "thatness") quickens under the influence of *Chit* which She reflects; then She longs to create (*vichikīṣṭu*) and becomes massive (*ghanibhūta*) and appears as *Vindu* (*Paravindu*). *Ghanibhūta* means that which was not dense or *ghana* but which has become so (*Ghanāvasthā*). It involves the notion of solidifying, coagulating, becoming massive. Thus milk is said to become *ghanibhūta* when it condenses into cream or curd. This is the first gross condition (*Sthūlāvasthā*;) the Brahman associated with *Māyā* in the form of *Karma* assumes that aspect in which It is regarded as the primal cause of the subtle and gross bodies. There then lies in it in a potential undifferentiated mass (*ghana*) the universe and beings about to be created. The *Paravindu* is thus a compact aspect of Shakti wherein action or *Kriyā* Shakti predominates. It is compared to a grain of *gram* (*chazaka*) which under its outer sheath (*māyā*) contains two seeds (*Shivashakti*) in close and undivided union. The *Vindu* is symbolised by a circle. The *Shūnya* or empty space within is the *Brahmapada*. The supreme Light is formless but *Vindu* implies both the void and *guṇa* for when *Shiva* becomes *Vindurūpa* He is with *guṇa*. *Rāghava* says "She alone can create. When the desire for appearance as all Her *Tattvas* seizes Her She assumes the state of *Vindu* whose characteristic is action" (*Kriyāshakti*). This *Vindu* or

Avyakta as it is the sprouting root of the universe is called the supreme Vindu (Paravindu) or causal or Kârana Vindu to distinguish it from that aspect of Itself which is called Vindu (Kâryya) which appears as a state of Shakti after the differentiation of the Paravindu in Sadṛishaparinâma. The Paravindu is the Îshvara of the Vedânta with Mâyâ as His Upâdhî. He is the Saguna Brahman that is the combined Chit Shakti and Mâyâ Shakti or Îshvara with undifferentiated Prakṛiti as His Avyaktasharîra. Some call Him Mahâvishnu and others the Brahmapurusha. Here is Paramshiva. "Some call the Hangsa, Devî. They are those who are filled with a passion for Her lotus feet." As Kâlîcharana the Commentator of the *Shat-chakranirûpana* says it matters not what It is called. It is adored by all. It is this Vindu or state of supreme Shakti which is worshipped in secret by all Devas. In Nishkala Shiva Prakṛiti exists in a hidden potential state. The Vindu or Parashaktimaya (Shivashaktimaya) is the first manifestation of creative activity which is both the expression and result of the universal Karma or store of unfulfilled desire for cosmic life.

It is then said that the Paravindu "divides" or "differentiates." In the Satyaloka is the formless and lustrous One. She exists like a grain of gram surrounding Herself with Mâyâ. When casting off (utsrîjya) the covering (bandhana) of Mâyâ She intent on creation (unmukhî) becomes twofold (dvîdhâ bhîttvâ) or according to account here given threefold and then on this differentiation in Shiva and Shakti (Shiva-Shakti-vibhâgena) arises creative ideation (*srîshṭikalpanâ*). As so unfolding the Vindu is known as the Sound Brahman (Shabdabrahman). "On the differentiation of the Paravindu there arose unmanifested Sound." (Bhidyamânât parâd vindoravyaktâtâmâ ravo 'bhavat). Shabda here of course does not mean physical sound which is the guna of the Kâryyâkâsha or atomic Âkâsha. The latter is integrated and limited and evolved at a later stage in Vikṛiti Parinâma from Tâmasika Ahankâra. Shabdabrahman is the undifferentiated Chidâkâsha or spiritual ether of philosophy in association with its Kalâ or Prakṛiti or the Sakala Shiva of religion. It is Chit Shakti vehicled by undifferentiated Prakṛiti from which is evolved Nâdamâtra ("Sound only" or the "Principle of Sound") which is unmanifest (Avyakta) from which again is displayed (Vyakta) the changing universe of names and forms. It is the Pranavarûpa Brahman or Om which is the cosmic causal principle and the manifested Shabdârtha. Avyakta Nâda or unmanifested Sound is the undifferentiated causal principle of Manifested Sound without any sign or characteristic manifestation such as letters and the like which mark its dis-

played product. Shabdabrahman is the all-pervading impartite unmanifested Nâdavindu substance, the primary creative impulse in Parashiva which is the cause of the manifested Shabdârtha. This Vindu is called Para because It is the first and supreme Vindu. Although It is Shakti like the Shakti and Nâda which precede It, It is considered as Shakti on the point of creating the world and as such It is from this Paravindu and not the states above It in the imaginary possession of Shakti that Atyakta Sound is said to come.

Râghava Bhatta ends the discussion of this matter by shortly saying that the Shabdabrahman is the Chaitanya in all creatures which as existing in breathing creatures (Prânî) is known as the Shakti Kundalinî of the Mûlâdhâra. The accuracy of this definition is contested by the Compiler of the *Prânatoshinî*, but if by Chaitanya we understand the Manifested Chit that is the latter displayed as and with Mûlaprakṛiti in Cosmic vibration (Spandana) then the apparently differing views are reconciled.

The Paravindu on such differentiation manifests under the threefold aspects of Vindu, Nâda, Vîja. This is the fully developed and kinetic aspect of Parashabda. The Vindu which thus becomes threefold is the Principle in which the germ of action sprouts to manifestation producing a state of compact intensive Shakti. The threefold aspect of Vindu, as Vindu (Kâryya), Nâda and Vîja are Shivamaya, Shivashaktimaya, Shaktimaya ; Para, Sûkṣma, Sthûla ; Ichchhâ, Jnâna, Kriyâ ; Tamas, Sattva, Rajas ; Moon, Fire and Sun ; and the Shaktis which are the cosmic bodies known as Īshvara, Hiranyagarbha, and Virâṭ. All three Vindu, Vîja, Nâda are the different phases of Shakti in creation being different aspects of Paravindu the Ghanâvâsthâ of Shakti. The order of the three Shaktis of will, action and knowledge differ in Īshvara and Jîva. Īshvara is all knowing and therefore the order in Him is Ichchhâ, Jnâna, Kriyâ. In Jîva it is Jnâna, Ichchhâ, Kriyâ. Ichchhâ is said to be the capacity which conceives the idea of work or action ; which brings the work before the mind and wills to do it. In this Vindu Tamas is said to be predominant for there is as yet no stir to action. Nâda is Jnâna Shakti that is the subjective direction of will by knowledge to the desired end. With it is associated Sattva. Vîja is Kriyâ Shakti or the Shakti which arises from that effort or the action done. With it Rajoguna or the principle of activity is associated. Kriyâ arises from the combination of Ichchhâ and Jnâna. It is thus said "Drawn by Ichchhâshakti, illumined by Jnânashakti, Shakti the Lord

appearing as Male creates (Kriyāshakti). From Vindu it is said arose Raudrī ; from Nāda, Jyeshthā ; and from Vija, Vāmā. From these arose Rudra, Brahmā, Vishnu. It is also said in the Gorakṣha Sanghitā "Ichchhā is Brāhmī, Kriyā is Vaiṣṇavī and Jñāna is Gaurī. Wherever there are these three Shaktis there is the Supreme Light called Om." In the Sakalā Parameshvara or Shabdābrahman in bodies (that is Kundalinī Shakti.) Vindu in which Tamas abounds is, Rāghava says, called Nirodhikā ; Nāda in which Sattva abounds is called Ardhendhu and Vija the combination of the two (Ichchhā and Jñāna) in which Rajas as Kriyā works is called Vindu. The three preceding states in Kundalinī are Shakti, Dhvani, and Nāda. Kundalinī is Chit Shakti into which Sattva enters a state known as the Paramākāśhāvasthā. When She in to whom Sattva has entered is next pierced by Rajas She is called Dhvani which is the Akṣharāvasthā. When She is again pierced by Tamas She is called Nāda. This is the Avyaktā-vasthā, the Avyakta Nāda which is the Paravindu. The three Vindus which are aspects of Paravindu constitute the mysterious Kāmakalā triangle which with the Hārddhakalā forms the roseate body of the lovely limbed great Devī Tripurāsundarī who is Shiva-kāmā and manifests the universe. She is the trinity of Divine energy of whom the Shrītattvārṇava says :— "those glorious men who worship in that body in Sāmarasya are freed from the waves of poison in the untraversable sea of the Wandering (Sangsāra)". The main principle which underlies the elaborate details here shortly summarised is this. The state in which Chit and Prakṛti exists as one undivided whole that is in which Prakṛti lies latent (Niskala Shiva) is succeeded by one of differentiation that is manifestation of Māyā (Sakalā Shiva). In such manifestation it displays several aspects. The totality of such aspects is the Māyā body of Īshvara in which are included the causal subtle and gross bodies of the Jīva. These are according to the Shāradā seven aspects of the first or Parā state of Sound in Shabdasrīṣṭī which are the seven divisions of the Mantra Om viz :—A, U, M, Nāda, Vindu, Shakti, Shānta. They constitute Parashabdasrīṣṭī in the Īshvara creation. They are Īshvara or Om and seven aspects of the cosmic causal body ; the collectivity (Samasrīṣṭī) of the individual (Vyeshṭī) causal, subtle and gross bodies of the Jīva.

Before passing to the manifested Word and Its meaning (Shabdārtha) it is necessary to note what is called Arthasrīṣṭī in the Avikṛti or Sadrīṣhapariwāma ; that is the causal state of Sound called Parashabda ; the other three states viz : Pashyanti Madhyamā and Vaikharī manifesting only in gross bodies. As

Paravindu is the causal body of Shabda. He is also the causal body of Artha which is inseparately associated with It as the combined Shabdârtha. As such He is called Shambhu who is of the nature of both Vindu and Kalâ and the associate of Kalâ. From Him issued Sadâshiva "the witness of the world" and from Him Îsha and then Rudra, Vishnu and Brahmâ. These six Shivas are various aspects of Chit as presiding over (the first) the subjective Tattvas and (the rest) the elemental world whose centres are the five lower Chakras. These Devatâs when considered as belonging to the Avikrîti Parinâma are the Devatâ aspect of apparently different states of causal sound by the process of resolution of like to like giving them the semblance of all pervasive creative energies. They are Sound powers in the aggregate (*Samashîti*). As appearing in, that is presiding over, bodies they are the ruling Lords of the individual (*Vyeshîti*) evolutes from the primal cause of Shabda.

The completion of the causal Avikrîti Parinâma with its ensuing Cosmic vibration in the Gunas is followed by a real Parinâma of the Vikrîtis from the substance of Mûlaprakrîti. There then appears the manifested Shabdârtha or the individual bodies subtle or gross of the Jîva in which are the remaining three Bhâvas of Sound or Shaktis called Pashyantî Madhyamâ, Vaikharî. Shabda literally means sound, idea, word ; and Artha its meaning ; that is the objective form which corresponds to the subjective conception formed and language spoken of it. The conception is and is due to Sangskâra. Artha is the externalised thought. There is a psycho-physical parallelism in the Jîva. In Îshvara thought is truly creative. The two are inseparable neither existing without the other. Shabdârtha has thus a composite meaning like the Greek word Logos which means both thought and word combined. By the manifested Shabdârtha is meant what the Vedântins call Nâmarûpa the unreal world of names and forms but with this difference that according to the Tântrik notions here discussed there is underlying this world of names and forms a real material cause that is Parashabda or Mûlaprakrîti manifesting as the principle of evolution.

The Shâradâ says that from the Unmanifested root Being in Vindu form (Mûlabhûta avyakta vindurûpa) or the Paravastu (Brahman) that is from Mûlaprakrîti in creative operation there is evolved the Sângkhyan Tattvas. This Tattvas^{ishîti} as it is called is regarded as real from the standpoint of Jîva ; the notion of vikrîti involving that of change just as the idea of Chit implies changelessness.

Transcendentally creation of all thing takes place simultaneously and transcendentally such things have only a Mâyik reality. But from the standpoint of Jîva there is a real development (Parivâma) from the substance of Mûlabhûta avyakta vindurûpa (as the Shâradâ calls Mûlaprakṛiti) of the Tattvas, Buddhi, Ahangkâra, Manas, the Indriyas, Tanmâtras and Mahâbhûtas in the order stated. The Tantra therefore adopts the Sângkhyan and not the Vedântic order of emanation which starts with the Apanchîkṛita Tanmâtra, the Tâmasik parts of which on the one hand develop by Panchîkarana into the Mahâbhûta and on the other the Râjasik and Sâttvik parts of which are collectively and separately the source of the remaining Tattvas. In the Tantra the Bhûtas derive directly and not by Panchîkarana from the Tanmâtras. Panchîkarana exists in respect of the compounds derived from the Bhûtas. There is a further point of detail in the Tântrik exposition to be noted. The Tantra, as the Purânas and Shaîva Shâstras do, speaks of a threefold aspect of Ahangkâra according to the predominance therein of the respective Gunas. From the Vaikârîka Ahangkâra issue the eleven Devatâs who preside over Manas and the ten Indriyas; from the Taijasa Ahangkâra is produced the Indriyas and Manas; and from the Bhûtâdika Ahangkâra the Tanmâtras. None of these differences in detail or order of emanation of the Tattvas have substantial importance. In one case start is made from the knowing principle (Buddhi), on the other from the subtle object of knowledge the Tanmâtra.

The abovementioned creation is known as Îshvara Srishti. The Vishvasâra Tantra says that from the Earth come the herbs (Ôshadhi) from the latter food, and from food seed (Retas). From the latter living beings are produced by the aid of sun and moon. Here what is called Jîva Srishti is indicated a matter into which I have no time to enter here.

The sum up, upon this ripening of Karma and the urge therefrom to cosmic life. Niskala Shiva becomes Sakala. Shakti manifests and the causal body of Îshvara is thought of as assuming seven causal aspects in Sadṛishaparivâma which are aspects of Shakti about to create. The Paravindu or state of Shakti thus developed is the causal body of both the manifested Shabda and Artha. The Paravindu is the source of all lines of development whether of Shabda or as Shambhu of Artha or as the Mûlabhûta of the Manifested Shabdârtha. On the completed ideal development of this causal body manifesting as the triple Shaktis of will, knowledge and action, the

Shabdârtha in the sense of the manifested world with its subtle and gross bodies appears in the order described.

From the above description it will have been seen that the creation doctrine here described is compounded of various elements some of which it shares with other Shâstras and some of which are its own, the whole being set forth according to a method and terminology which is peculiar to itself. Thus there is *Adrishta Srishti* up to the appearance of Shakti as Paravindu. The theory which is a form of Advaitavâda has then characteristics which are both Sâṅkhyan and Vedântic. With the latter it posits a Nirguna Âtmâ and Mâyâ in the sense that Avidyâ produces an apparent changing manifold where there is a real unchanging unity. In this Tâṅtrik Advaitavâda, three special points are Shaktitattva the reality of Mûlaprakṛti *Sadrishaparinâma* which is a kind of Vivartta and a doctrine of Laya. This development extends up to the appearance of the manifested Shabdârtha. In such development it posits a real principle of Becoming or Mûlaprakṛti. Thereafter it states a real *Parinâma* of the Tattvas in general agreement with the Sâṅkhya. Other points of similarity with the latter system have been already noted. Lastly there is Yaugika *Srishti* of the Nyâya Vaisheshika in that the world is held to be formed by a combination of the elements. It accepts therefore *Adrishta Srishti* up to the appearance of Shakti, Vivartta *Srishti* up to complete formation of the causal body known as the Kâmakalâ thereafter *Parinâma Srishti* of the Vikritis of the subtle and gross body produced from the causal body down to the Mahâbhûtas; and finally Yaugika *Srishti* in so far as it is the Bhûtas which in varied combination go to make up the gross world.

There are (and the doctrine here discussed is an instance of it) common principles and mutual connections existing in and between the different Indian Shâstras notwithstanding individual peculiarities of presentment due to natural variety of intellectual or temperamental standpoint or the purpose in view. Shiva in the *Kulârnavâ* says that all the Darshanas are parts of His body and he who severs them severs His limbs. The meaning of this is that the six Darshanas are the six minds and these as all else are parts of the Lord's Body.

Of these six minds Nyâya, Vaisheshika teach Yaugika *Srishti*; Sâṅkhya and Patanjali teach Yaugika *Srishti* and *Parinâma Srishti*; Vedânta teaches Yaugika *Srishti*, *Parinâma-srishti* according to the empirical method and Vivartta according to the transcendental method. All agree in the doctrine that

the first impulse to creation comes from *Adrishta*. The Tantra includes all these various forms of *Srishti* adding thereto an *Adrishta Srishti* of the nature above described. In this sense it is their synthesis.
